



PCT

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION
International Bureau

INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT)

<p>(51) International Patent Classification ⁷ : E21B 44/00, 49/00</p>	A1	<p>(11) International Publication Number: WO 00/50735</p> <p>(43) International Publication Date: 31 August 2000 (31.08.00)</p>		
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;"> <p>(21) International Application Number: PCT/US00/04626</p> <p>(22) International Filing Date: 24 February 2000 (24.02.00)</p> <p>(30) Priority Data: 60/121,344 24 February 1999 (24.02.99) US</p> <p>(71) Applicant: ~ BAKER HUGHES INCORPORATED [-/US]; Suite 1200, 3900 Essex Lane, Houston, TX 77027 (US).</p> <p>(72) Inventors: LEDGERWOOD, Leroy, III; 15323 Hillside Park- way, Cypress, TX 77429 (US). COOLEY, Craig, H.; 863 Windemere Lane, South Ogden, UT 84403 (US). CURRY, David, A.; Carronbank House, Cameron Street, Stonehaven, AB39 2HS (GB).</p> <p>(74) Agents: RIDDLE, J., Albert et al.; Baker Hughes Incorporated, 3900 Essex Lane, Suite 1200, Houston, TX 77027 (US).</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;"> <p>(81) Designated States: AE, AL, AM, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BR, BY, CA, CH, CN, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, EE, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KP, KR, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, MA, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, NO, NZ, PL, PT, RO, RU, SD, SE, SG, SI, SK, SL, TJ, TM, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, UZ, VN, YU, ZA, ZW, ARIPO patent (GH, GM, KE, LS, MW, SD, SL, SZ, TZ, UG, ZW), Eurasian patent (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, MD, RU, TJ, TM), European patent (AT, BE, CH, CY, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, IE, IT, LU, MC, NL, PT, SE), OAPI patent (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, GW, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG).</p> <p>Published <i>With international search report. Before the expiration of the time limit for amending the claims and to be republished in the event of the receipt of amendments.</i></p> </td> </tr> </table>			<p>(21) International Application Number: PCT/US00/04626</p> <p>(22) International Filing Date: 24 February 2000 (24.02.00)</p> <p>(30) Priority Data: 60/121,344 24 February 1999 (24.02.99) US</p> <p>(71) Applicant: ~ BAKER HUGHES INCORPORATED [-/US]; Suite 1200, 3900 Essex Lane, Houston, TX 77027 (US).</p> <p>(72) Inventors: LEDGERWOOD, Leroy, III; 15323 Hillside Park- way, Cypress, TX 77429 (US). COOLEY, Craig, H.; 863 Windemere Lane, South Ogden, UT 84403 (US). CURRY, David, A.; Carronbank House, Cameron Street, Stonehaven, AB39 2HS (GB).</p> <p>(74) Agents: RIDDLE, J., Albert et al.; Baker Hughes Incorporated, 3900 Essex Lane, Suite 1200, Houston, TX 77027 (US).</p>	<p>(81) Designated States: AE, AL, AM, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BR, BY, CA, CH, CN, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, EE, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KP, KR, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, MA, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, NO, NZ, PL, PT, RO, RU, SD, SE, SG, SI, SK, SL, TJ, TM, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, UZ, VN, YU, ZA, ZW, ARIPO patent (GH, GM, KE, LS, MW, SD, SL, SZ, TZ, UG, ZW), Eurasian patent (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, MD, RU, TJ, TM), European patent (AT, BE, CH, CY, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, IE, IT, LU, MC, NL, PT, SE), OAPI patent (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, GW, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG).</p> <p>Published <i>With international search report. Before the expiration of the time limit for amending the claims and to be republished in the event of the receipt of amendments.</i></p>
<p>(21) International Application Number: PCT/US00/04626</p> <p>(22) International Filing Date: 24 February 2000 (24.02.00)</p> <p>(30) Priority Data: 60/121,344 24 February 1999 (24.02.99) US</p> <p>(71) Applicant: ~ BAKER HUGHES INCORPORATED [-/US]; Suite 1200, 3900 Essex Lane, Houston, TX 77027 (US).</p> <p>(72) Inventors: LEDGERWOOD, Leroy, III; 15323 Hillside Park- way, Cypress, TX 77429 (US). COOLEY, Craig, H.; 863 Windemere Lane, South Ogden, UT 84403 (US). CURRY, David, A.; Carronbank House, Cameron Street, Stonehaven, AB39 2HS (GB).</p> <p>(74) Agents: RIDDLE, J., Albert et al.; Baker Hughes Incorporated, 3900 Essex Lane, Suite 1200, Houston, TX 77027 (US).</p>	<p>(81) Designated States: AE, AL, AM, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BR, BY, CA, CH, CN, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, EE, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KP, KR, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, MA, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, NO, NZ, PL, PT, RO, RU, SD, SE, SG, SI, SK, SL, TJ, TM, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, UZ, VN, YU, ZA, ZW, ARIPO patent (GH, GM, KE, LS, MW, SD, SL, SZ, TZ, UG, ZW), Eurasian patent (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, MD, RU, TJ, TM), European patent (AT, BE, CH, CY, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, IE, IT, LU, MC, NL, PT, SE), OAPI patent (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, GW, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG).</p> <p>Published <i>With international search report. Before the expiration of the time limit for amending the claims and to be republished in the event of the receipt of amendments.</i></p>			
<p>(54) Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DETERMINING POTENTIAL ABRASIVITY IN A WELLBORE</p> <p>(57) Abstract</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p>A method is provided for gener- ating an indicator of potential bit abra- sion in a particular wellbore. Forensic wellbore data is obtained from at least one previously drilled wellbore which is determined to be comparable to the particular target wellbore. Typically, the comparable wellbore comprises an "offset" wellbore which is proximate the target wellbore, and which has sim- ilar geologic features. An inference engine computer program is provided which consists of executable program instructions. It is adapted to uti- lize a plurality of wellbore parameters, including the forensic wellbore data. The inference engine includes at least one rule matrix which defines a plu- rality of fuzzy sets. These fuzzy sets establish correspondence between the plurality of wellbore parameters and the indicator of potential bit abrasion. The inference engine computer pro- gram is loaded onto a data processing system. At least the forensic wellbore data is supplied as an input to the infer- ence engine computer program. The data processing system is utilized to execute the program instructions of the inference engine computer program. This causes the application of the inputs to the inference engine computer program. The inference engine computer program produces as an output an indication of potential bit abrasion in the particular target wellbore.</p> </div> <div style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"> <pre> graph LR 105[MUD TYPE] --> 101[RULE MATRIX ENGINE] MW[MUD WEIGHT] --> 101 BHP[BOTTOM HOLE PRESSURE] --> 101 WP[WELLBORE PRESSURE] --> 101 CS[COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH] --> 101 FA[FRICTION ANGLE] --> 101 ME[MODULI OF ELASTICITY] --> 101 LD[LITHOLOGY DATA] --> 101 101 -- 103 --> I[INDICATOR OF POTENTIAL BIT PERFORMANCE] </pre> </div> </div>				

FOR THE PURPOSES OF INFORMATION ONLY

Codes used to identify States party to the PCT on the front pages of pamphlets publishing international applications under the PCT.

AL	Albania	ES	Spain	LS	Lesotho	SI	Slovenia
AM	Armenia	FI	Finland	LT	Lithuania	SK	Slovakia
AT	Austria	FR	France	LU	Luxembourg	SN	Senegal
AU	Australia	GA	Gabon	LV	Latvia	SZ	Swaziland
AZ	Azerbaijan	GB	United Kingdom	MC	Monaco	TD	Chad
BA	Bosnia and Herzegovina	GE	Georgia	MD	Republic of Moldova	TG	Togo
BB	Barbados	GH	Ghana	MG	Madagascar	TJ	Tajikistan
BE	Belgium	GN	Guinea	MK	The former Yugoslav	TM	Turkmenistan
BF	Burkina Faso	GR	Greece		Republic of Macedonia	TR	Turkey
BG	Bulgaria	HU	Hungary	ML	Mali	TT	Trinidad and Tobago
BJ	Benin	IE	Ireland	MN	Mongolia	UA	Ukraine
BR	Brazil	IL	Israel	MR	Mauritania	UG	Uganda
BY	Belarus	IS	Iceland	MW	Malawi	US	United States of America
CA	Canada	IT	Italy	MX	Mexico	UZ	Uzbekistan
CF	Central African Republic	JP	Japan	NE	Niger	VN	Viet Nam
CG	Congo	KE	Kenya	NL	Netherlands	YU	Yugoslavia
CH	Switzerland	KG	Kyrgyzstan	NO	Norway	ZW	Zimbabwe
CI	Côte d'Ivoire	KP	Democratic People's	NZ	New Zealand		
CM	Cameroon		Republic of Korea	PL	Poland		
CN	China	KR	Republic of Korea	PT	Portugal		
CU	Cuba	KZ	Kazakstan	RO	Romania		
CZ	Czech Republic	LC	Saint Lucia	RU	Russian Federation		
DE	Germany	LI	Liechtenstein	SD	Sudan		
DK	Denmark	LK	Sri Lanka	SE	Sweden		
EE	Estonia	LR	Liberia	SG	Singapore		

5

**METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DETERMINING POTENTIAL
ABRASIVITY IN A WELLBORE**

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

10 This application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application Serial No. 60/121,344, filed 24 February 1999, entitled Method and Apparatus for Determining Potential Abrasivity in a Wellbore.

Field of the Invention:

15 The present invention relates in general to computer implemented processes for improving drilling operations, and in particular to a system and method for facilitating the selection and use of drill bits in order to minimize the negative impact of abrasivity of the earth formation.

Description of the Prior Art:

20 Bit abrasion is an undesirable operating condition which impedes drilling operations. In general, drilling operations are performed in a manner which minimizes the possibility of the occurrence of bit abrasion. One factor which can be controlled is the selection of particular drill bits from a group of available drill bits. Certain bits may be less prone to abrasion under certain drilling conditions, while other bits are more prone to abrasion under certain drilling conditions.

25

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

30 It is one objective of the present invention to provide a new system, method, and apparatus for providing an indicator of potential bit abrasion in a particular wellbore, which utilizes an inference engine computer program which consists of executable instructions, and which is adapted to utilize a plurality of wellbore parameters as inputs, including forensic wellbore data, and which includes at least one rule matrix which defines a plurality of fuzzy sets which establish correspondence between the plurality of wellbore parameters and the indicator of potential bit abrasion.

35 It is another objective of the present invention to provide such an indicator of potential bit performance which provides an indication of the potential for undesirable abrasivity of earth formations.

5 It is another objective of the present invention to provide an indicator which may be utilized in selecting particular drill bits for use in a particular wellbore.

The foregoing and additional objectives are achieved as follows. A method is provided for generating an indicator of potential bit abrasion in a particular wellbore. Forensic wellbore data is obtained from at least one previously drilled wellbore which is determined to be comparable to the particular target wellbore. Typically, the comparable wellbore comprises an "offset" wellbore which is proximate the target wellbore, and which has similar geologic features. An inference engine computer program is provided which consists of executable program instructions. It is adapted to utilize a plurality of wellbore parameters, including the forensic wellbore data. The inference engine includes at least one rule matrix which defines a plurality of fuzzy sets. These fuzzy sets establish correspondence between the plurality of wellbore parameters and the indicator of potential bit abrasion. The inference engine computer program is loaded onto a data processing system. At least the forensic wellbore data is supplied as an input to the inference engine computer program. The data processing system is utilized to execute the program instructions of the inference engine computer program. This causes the application of the inputs to the inference engine computer program. The inference engine computer program produces as an output an indication of potential bit abrasion in the particular target wellbore.

25 The above as well as additional objectives, features, and advantages will become apparent in the following description.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

The novel features believed characteristic of the invention are set forth in the appended claims.

30 The invention itself however, as well as a preferred mode of use, further objectives and advantages thereof, will best be understood by reference to the following detailed description of the preferred embodiment when read in conjunction with the accompanying drawings, wherein:

35 Figure 1 is a simplified pictorial representation of drilling operations which may be conducted in accordance with the present invention.

5 Figure 2 is a block diagram representation of the types of wellbore parameters which may be utilized in accordance with the preferred and alternative embodiments of the present invention.

Figure 3 is a pictorial representation of a data processing system.

10 Figure 4 is a graphical representation of the mohs number for particular minerals.

Figure 5 is a graphical representation of the methodology utilized to determine insitu strength.

Figure 6 is a graphical representation of the mohr coulomb failure.

15

Figure 7 is a three-dimensional graphical representation of insitu strength in psi, friction angle in degrees, and bottomhole pressure in psi.

20 Figure 8 is a graphical representation of the preferred rule matrix utilized in the preferred embodiment of the present invention.

Figure 9 is a graphical representation of the concept of fuzzy set membership.

25 Figure 10 is a graphical representation of set membership versus confined compressive strength in psi.

Figure 11 is a graphical representation of set membership versus sand content.

30 Figure 12 is a graphical representation of the defuzzification of the abrasivity index.

Figure 13 is a pictorial representation of test results for a test well.

Figure 14 is a flowchart representation of the preferred embodiment of the computer program.

35 Table 1 a graph which represents factors which are considered in determining the abrasion index.

5

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION

OVERVIEW OF DRILLING OPERATIONS: Figure 1 depicts one example of drilling operations conducted in accordance with the present invention with a downhole drill bit selected in accordance with the present invention based upon its suitability for the drilling conditions based at least in part upon its compatibility to a projected or anticipated potential for formation abrasivity as determined by an abrasivity index.

As is shown, a conventional rig 3 includes a derrick 5, derrick floor 7, draw works 9, hook 11, swivel 13, kelly joint 15, and rotary table 17. A drillstring 19 which includes drill pipe section 21 and drill collar section 23 extends downward from rig 3 into wellbore 1. Drill collar section 23 preferably includes a number of tubular drill collar members which connect together, including a measurement-while-drilling logging subassembly and cooperating mud pulse telemetry data transmission subassembly, which are collectively referred to hereinafter as "measurement and communication system 25".

During drilling operations, drilling fluid is circulated from mud pit 27 through mud pump 29, through a desurger 31, and through mud supply line 33 into swivel 13. The drilling mud flows through the kelly joint and an axial central bore in the drillstring. Eventually, it exists through jets which are located in downhole drill bit 26 which is connected to the lowermost portion of measurement and communication system 25. The drilling mud flows back up through the annular space between the outer surface of the drillstring and the inner surface of wellbore 1, to be circulated to the surface where it is returned to mud pit 27 through mud return line 35. A shaker screen (which is not shown) separates formation cuttings from the drilling mud before it returns to mud pit 27.

Preferably, measurement and communication system 25 utilizes a mud pulse telemetry technique to communicate data from a downhole location to the surface while drilling operations take place. To receive data at the surface, transducer 37 is provided in communication with mud supply line 33. This transducer generates electrical signals in response to drilling mud pressure variations. These electrical signals are transmitted by a surface conductor 39 to a surface electronic processing system 41, which is preferably a data processing system with a central processing unit for executing program instructions, and for responding to user commands entered through either a keyboard or a graphical pointing

5 device. The mud pulse telemetry system is provided for communicating data to the surface concerning numerous downhole conditions sensed by well logging transducers or measurement systems that are ordinarily located within measurement and communication system 25. Mud pulses that define the data propagated to the surface are produced by equipment which is located within measurement and communication system 25. Such
10 equipment typically comprises a pressure pulse generator operating under control of electronics contained in an instrument housing to allow drilling mud to vent through an orifice extending through the drill collar wall. Each time the pressure pulse generator causes such venting, a negative pressure pulse is transmitted to be received by surface transducer 37. An alternative conventional arrangement generates and transmits positive pressure pulses. As is
15 conventional, the circulating mud provides a source of energy for a turbine-driven generator subassembly which is located within measurement and communication system 25. The turbine-driven generator generates electrical power for the pressure pulse generator and for various circuits including those circuits which form the operational components of the measurement-while-drilling tools. As an alternative or supplemental source of electrical
20 power, batteries may be provided, particularly as a back-up for the turbine-driven generator.

Figure 2 is a block diagram pictorial representation of the broad concept of the present invention. As is shown, a rule matrix inference engine 101 produces as an output 103 an indicator of potential bit performance. A number of inputs 105 may be provided to the rule
25 matrix inference engine 101. Figure 2 depicts exemplary types of input data including mud type, mud weight, bottomhole pressure, wellbore pressure, compressive strength, friction angle, moduli of elasticity, lithology including sand content. In the preferred embodiment of the present invention, lithology data from offset wells is provided as one input. These wells are located proximate the target well, and likely traverse similar geologic formations at particular
30 depths. The target well is expected to traverse the same types of formations at generally the same types of depths. Therefore, the offset wells provide a good indication of the sand content that is going to be drilled in the target well. In accordance with the preferred embodiment of the present invention, the likely strength of the formation of the target well is also provided as an input to the rule matrix inference engine 101. In the preferred embodiment, the rule matrix
35 inference engine 101 receives these two types of input, one being derived from forensic log data and the other being projected strength and produces a numerical indicator of potential bit abrasion. In the preferred embodiment of the present invention, this data is used in the

5 planning stages of the target wellbore in order to select the types of bits which are more suitable for particular drilling conditions which have a greater potential for bit balling. In other words, the rule matrix inference engine 101 is utilized in well planning operations in order to select particular bits which might perform better under projected abrasion conditions.

10 The rule matrix inference engine 101 of Figure 2 is preferably constructed utilizing executable program instructions. Preferably, the program instructions are executed by a general purpose data processing system, such as that depicted in Figure 3.

15 With reference now to the figures and in particular with reference to Figure 3, there is depicted a pictorial representation of data processing system 41 which may be programmed in accordance with the present invention. As may be seen, data processing system 41 includes processor 12 which preferably includes a graphics processor, memory device and central processor (not shown). Coupled to processor 12 is video display 14 which may be implemented utilizing either a color or monochromatic monitor, in a manner well known in
20 the art. Also coupled to processor 12 is keyboard 16. Keyboard 16 preferably comprises a standard computer keyboard which is coupled to the processor by means of cable 18.

Also coupled to processor 12 is a graphical pointing device, such as mouse 20. Mouse 20 is coupled to processor 12, in a manner well known in the art, via cable 22. As is shown, mouse
25 20 may include left button 24, and right button 26, each of which may be depressed, or "clicked", to provide command and control signals to data processing system 41. While the disclosed embodiment of the present invention utilizes a mouse, those skilled in the art will appreciate that any graphical pointing device such as a light pen or touch sensitive screen may be utilized to implement the method and apparatus of the present invention. Upon reference to
30 the foregoing, those skilled in the art will appreciate that data processing system 41 may be implemented utilizing a so-called personal computer.

In accordance with the preferred embodiment of the present invention, the rule matrix inference engine 101 (of Figure 2) is constructed of executable instructions which are executed
35 by a data processing system 41. What follows is a discussion of abrasivity, the abrasivity index which is generated in accordance with the present invention, a discussion of the variables believed to affect abrasivity, a description of the rule matrix, a description of fuzzy

5 set methodology, a discussion of application of the abrasivity index to one test well, and a discussion of the contents of the computer implemented rule matrix inference engine 101 of Figure 2.

10 ABRASION IN GENERAL: Drilling strategies most often depend on the particular formations to be drilled and how they might affect the ultimate performance degradation of the bit. For example, the insertion point of PDC bits is often picked to be at the start of long shale or carbonate sequences, if possible, leaving any abrasive sand horizons to be drilled towards the end of the run. This provides for fast drilling in the overlying non abrasive rock while the dulling takes place at the end of the run in the sand. The result is an overall fast rate of
15 penetration and good economics.

Absent dynamic effects and the well documented concomitant drill bit damage, cutter tooth abrasion or wear plays the largest role in bit performance degradation. Since this abrasion is highly dependent on the formations types, and the stress state under which these formations
20 are drilled it seems reasonable to calculate an abrasivity index that will provide some measure of abrasiveness. This, in turn, could be used to pick insertion points for particular drill bit types or otherwise influence drilling strategy.

25 AN ABRASIVITY INDEX: One goal of this work was to provide an index that ranges from 0 to 1 and that corresponds to the abrasion potential of a given formation. Preferably, this index is derived from wire line log data that is readily available.

30 An abrasivity index of '0' would correspond to absolutely no abrasive wear potential and '1' to an almost certain severe abrasive wear potential. Values above '0.5' would be deemed to be problematic. Further, the underlying algorithms should depend on the minimum number of formation parameters (independent variables) while still maintaining the ability to predict abrasion potential. Simplicity in this respect makes it easier to understand cause and effect relationships and facilitates adjusting the algorithm to field experience.

35 It is well known that some operating parameter such as bit rotary speed and weight can have dramatic effects on wear. In the preferred embodiment, operating parameters are not considered as part of this index since they are not always known ahead of time and since they

5 can not always be prescribed with certainty. In the preferred embodiment, this index calculates a potential for abrasive wear based solely on formation (particularly sand content) and insitu stress data that has been obtained from wireline logs and other readily available sources.

10 VARIABLES BELIEVED TO AFFECT BIT WEAR: Abrasive wear results when two or more bodies of different hardness are rubbed together. Asperities in the harder material act like small cutters that plastically gouge chips from the softer material. Abrasive wear strongly depends on material hardness which is directly proportional to the yield strength of the material and which is ranked by a number of precisely defined scales. The Moh's scale which
15 is used mostly by geologists to describe the hardness of various minerals and for that reason is interesting for drilling rock is shown in Figure 4 with other scales for comparison. It should be noted that the Moh's scale is non-linear but interesting because certain minerals have convenient values, most notably diamond which has a value of 10 and quartz which has a value of 7. When a material is chosen to cut or remove another material it must be much
20 harder than the material it will be removing. Diamond (Moh's hardness = 10) and tungsten carbide, (Moh's hardness > 9) are used almost exclusively to remove rock which often has a hardness of 7, quartz (sand).

In the case of a drag bit, diamond cutters backed with tungsten carbide scrape along a rock
25 surface removing the material. In this process, the harder rock minerals, most importantly, quartz, are surprisingly capable of blunting diamond and tungsten carbide even though these minerals are significantly softer than diamond and tungsten carbide.

Lee and Hibbs (1978) explain how quartz and other rock minerals are able to wear polycrystalline diamond. They found that the diamond was removed by a small scale
30 microfracturing process which was characterized by the dislodging and pulling out of individual diamond grains. This process continues until eventually relatively large wear flats form which, in turn, are capable of degrading cutter performance.

According to Glowka, et al. (1984), heat generated by friction between the rock and cutter at
35 the wear flat removes the cobalt (Co) in the WC substrate directly behind the diamond. Once the Co, which to some extent binds the tungsten carbide, is removed tungsten carbide fracturing quickly follows. This leads to diamond table fracture because of the lack of support

5 for the diamond table against drilling induced loading. This heat related mechanism operates in tandem with the diamond microfracturing mechanism described by Lee and Hibbs.

The end result is that rock minerals that are significantly softer than both diamond and tungsten carbide can cause significant wear to the cutting tool. If drilling parameters are chosen that generate a lot of heat, for example high weight, high rotary speed or both; or if the
10 formation to be drilled has a high quartz (sand) content this wear can proceed at a very fast pace, indeed.

In addition to hardness, the shape of the quartz grains and how tightly these grains are held in place (how strong the formation is) are thought to play a role in abrasiveness. Angular quartz
15 grains that are firmly held in place are felt to be more abrasive than round ones that are loose. Goodman, et al. (1997) and Ledgerwood (1995) have postulated that the internal angle of friction of a sand or sandstone formation is a direct measure of the formation abrasiveness and related to rock strength. The hard proof of this is still outstanding though circumstantial evidence seems to confirm the idea.

20 Plumb (1994) and Ledgerwood (1995) have demonstrated that internal friction can be estimated from rock porosity and other measures making it possible to estimate abrasion potential from log data. We also have the ability to estimate unconfined compressive strength from sonic transit times. Given UCS and internal angle of friction it is possible to calculate an
25 'insitu' strength.

Assuming the above to be true, it seems reasonable that the initial abrasion index could depend on formation constituent mineral hardness as determined by sand content and strength as determined by insitu or confined compressive strength. Sand content is determined by the
30 lithology recognizer directly and will serve as an input to the abrasion index. 'Insitu' formation strength is determined by the UCS and internal angle of friction. More will be said about how these are calculated and interpreted later. In summary Table 1 in describes in broad overview our strategy for the abrasion index.

35 THE MEANING OF 'INSITU' STRENGTH: Unconfined compressive strength (UCS) can be calculated from sonic transit time and lithology data. This was chosen because it is simple. Some in the industry claim to calculate 'insitu' strength, but then are unclear when explaining

5 exactly what they have calculated. We feel that 'insitu' strength can be meaningful, particularly for an abrasion index but one has to be clear with regard to how it was calculated and what it means.

10 Rock failure is often described using the Mohr Coulomb failure criteria. Accordingly, failure strength is not one value, but increases as the confining pressure on the fabric of the rock increases. It follows that in the drilling environment the strength of the rock being drilled will depend on the stresses applied to the rock by its surroundings. This includes pressure from the mud column, stresses induced by the cutter, stresses induced by the lithostatic column of rock, possibly stress concentration factors resulting from the bore hole and stresses induced by the
15 formation pressure. It is further complicated by the fact that some of these stresses can vary with time and the advance of the drill bit. For example, the pore pressure will increase as filtrate from the mud invades the pore space of the soon to be drilled rock.

20 Because of the above, calculating the 'insitu' rock strength right at the cutter is very difficult although some researchers have looked at parts of the problem. Galle and Wilhoit (1961) calculate the stress concentration factors resulting from a bore hole in a semi- infinite half space, and Warren and Smith (1985) discuss the changes that occur in effective stress in a non permeable rock (shale) as a bore hole approaches from above. Hanson and Tibbitts (1991) discuss the rate of mud filtration at the bore hole boundary and its affect on effective stress and
25 finally Kolle (1993) discusses how rock porosity and permeability and the loading rate of the cutter can lead to dynamic confining or strengthening.

For simplicity, we have elected to calculate the strength of the rock at the side of the bore hole and at least one bore hole diameter away from the bottom as shown in Figure 5. We have
30 decided to calculate the 'insitu' stress value that corresponds to the strongest the rock at this location could potentially become by assuming that the effective confining stress (the stress on the rock fabric that strengthens the rock) is equivalent to the total bottom hole pressure. Finally, we have elected to ignore the effects that the cutting process would have on the potential strengthening or weakening of the rock. As assumed above, this estimated 'insitu'
35 strength value corresponds to the value one would measure in a compression test machine as described below with the confining stress set equal to the bottom hole pressure.

5 CALCULATING 'INSITU' STRENGTH: Our goal is to calculate 'insitu' strength as a function of the parameters that we know from wire line logs, mud weight and depth. Before doing so it is informative to understand a few of the fundamentals of rock testing.

10 ROCK FAILURE STRENGTH DETERMINATION: 'Insitu' rock strength is normally determined by performing a suite of compression tests on right circular rock samples. The goal is to perform one or more tests at a number of confining pressures and by so doing obtain a value for the strength of the rock at each confining stress. These data are then plotted according to an accepted failure theory such as Mohr Coulomb.

15 Mohr Coulomb failure theory is represented in shear stress - normal stress space. Figure 6 illustrates a typical plot of two triaxial compression tests. The confining stress, s_3 , (we assume this equal to the Bottom Hole Pressure, BHP) and the compressive stress at failure s_1 are plotted on the horizontal axis and a circle of diameter $s_1 - s_3$ is drawn with the center at $(s_1 + s_3)/2$. This is done for each test. A line is then drawn as closely as possible tangent to the circles as shown in Figure 6. Stress states below this line are safe and above this line are failure. The slope is equal to the tangent of the angle of internal friction, ϕ . Large angles of internal friction mean that this line is steep and imply that the rock strengthens significantly with confining stress. The shear value corresponding to the tangent point of the circle and line represents the 'insitu' shear strength for the stress state represented by that particular circle.

20 The line's intercept with the vertical axis is called the cohesion and represents the shear strength of the rock in a direct shear test. This is different from the unconfined compression strength which corresponds to the s_1 value for a test conducted at zero confining pressure.

25 As mentioned above, sonic velocities and lithology have been shown to correlate with the unconfined compressive strength and rock porosity and other measures have been shown to correlate with the angle of internal friction. Knowing these two parameter it is possible to construct a Mohr Coulomb failure diagram and calculate the rock strength for any stress state, or in other words, calculate an estimate of 'insitu' strength. The 'insitu' strength we will be calculating corresponds to s_1 in Figure 6.

35

CALCULATION: For the purposes of routine calculation it is more convenient to recast s_1 (confined compressive strength) into a function of confining stress, friction angle, and

5 cohesion. We have done this and the equation in Figure 7 is the result. Our calculation, estimates maximum rock strength sets confining pressure equal to bottom hole pressure, estimates the friction angle from porosity and estimates the unconfined compressive strength from sonic velocities and the lithology identifier. A plot of what the confined compressive strength is for a range friction angle and bottomhole pressure values is shown in Figure 7.

10 DESCRIBING THE RULE MATRIX: There is no 'right and only' method for constructing or calculating the abrasivity index. The goal is to provide a warning if there is a potential of abrasivity and the basis for calculating that warning or index is solely based on past experience. The calculation should be readily modifiable if new or different experience is
15 gained in the future. For simplicity the two parameters discussed above were decided on: sand content and strength. A rule matrix was constructed as shown in Figure 8. Here, the main parameters are 'insitu' strength which is calculated as described above and which takes on the values of High Strength, HS; Medium Strength, MS; and Low Strength, LS. Sand content which is extracted from the lithology identifier takes on the values of No Sand, NS; Low Sand, LS, Medium Sand, MS; and High Sand, HS. These independent variables are mapped into the
20 abrasive index variables which are determined by the rule matrix and which can take on the values No Abrasion, NA; Low Abrasion, LA; Medium Abrasion, MA; and High Abrasion, HA. This rule set is our first guess and subject to further improvement.

25 FUZZY SET METHODS: Fuzzy methods can be described using Figure 9. In this example, tallness set membership is plotted versus height. One might ask: "when is a person considered tall?". A crisp answer might be stated as, "if height equal to or greater than 6' 0" then tall". What if a person is 5' 11"? Is he then short? The all or nothing aspect of crisp values is in this case unsatisfactory.

30 Using fuzzy set theory the following statement would be made, "if height equal to 6' 0" then 0.5 tall". The person belongs 50% to the tallness set and presumably 50% to the shortness set. A person 6' 3" tall would belong approximately 75% to the tallness set and so forth.

35 Figures 10 and 11 depict the fuzzy sets that have been constructed for confined compressive strength and sand content and make possible the transformation of a crisp value taken from a log into the linguistic variables described above. For example, let us assume we have a UCS

5 reading of "A" and a sand content of "60%" psi. From Figure 10 it can be seen that a strength of "A" belongs about 60% to the medium strength "MS" set and about 40% to the high strength, "HS" set. Similar considerations for sand content would show 80% membership to the medium sand, 'MS' set and about 20% membership to the low sand 'LS' set.

10 Each combination of strength and sand content sets forms an input pair. Not all the rules, however, are fired with the same intensity. The degree of firing depends on the minimum set membership value of each pair. Defuzzifying the four minima is accomplished with an output fuzzy set that for our example is shown in Figure 12. There is a bar or set for each severity of abrasivity ("NA" for no abrasion; "LA" for low abrasivity; "MA" for moderate abrasivity; and
15 "SA" for severe abrasivity). The height of each bar ranges from '0' to '1' and is determined by the values of the four minima. This is illustrated in Figure 12. These sets are then geometrically combined and the centroid of the result geometric area calculated. The value of this centroid represents the defuzzified balling index of 0.5 as shown in Figure 12.

20 Calculating the abrasivity index using the above rule set and the fuzzy set methods for all combinations of strength and sand content results in the response surface which should be smooth and 'well behaved'.

If experience should show that the abrasivity index is not accurate, modification is done
25 simply by changing the rule matrix to more closely agree with the new experience. Of course the assumption, here, is that strength and sand content are the most influential parameters that describe balling abrasivity. If another variable is found to be more or as important it could either replace one of the above or be added into the scheme by using additional rule matrices. Care must be taken, however, since each new variable dramatically increases the number of
30 rules that must be calibrated.

Example Well, Baker Hughes Experimental Test Area, Beggs, Oklahoma: Baker Hughes operates an experimental drilling facility in Beggs, OK about 30 miles southwest of Tulsa. The formations have been extensively logged to about 3000 feet vertical depth. Because the
35 well is shallow calculated abrasivity will be primarily a function of sand content. The calculation was performed for known abrasive formations scattered through the interval of 2500-3000 feet. The results are shown and correlated with lithology in Figure 13. As

5 can be seen the abrasivity index does jump to values above 0.5 when the sand content is high. Obviously, more field calibrations at greater depth need to be performed.

Figure 14 is a flowchart representation of the preferred embodiment of the computer program of the present invention. As is shown, the computer program receives inputs 201, 203. Input
10 201 is data which represents the strength of the formation (and which is based on forensic information), while input 203 represents the sand content of the likely formation. These are supplied as an input to block 205 which transforms the crisp memberships into memberships in fuzzy sets. The fuzzy strength information and fuzzy sand content information is provided as an input to block 207, which fires the appropriate rules in the rule matrix and the signs
15 degree of firing. Next, in accordance with block 209, the contributions from each rule is geometrically combined to calculate a centroid. Then, in accordance with block 211, an abrasivity index is generated which provides the useful information.

Although the invention has been described with reference to a particular embodiment, this
20 description is not meant to be construed in a limiting sense. Various modifications of the disclosed embodiments as well as alternative embodiments of the invention will become apparent to persons skilled in the art upon reference to the description of the invention. It is therefore contemplated that the appended claims will cover any such modifications or embodiments that fall within the scope of the invention.

5

What is claimed is:

1. A method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit in a particular wellbore, comprising:

10

(a) obtaining forensic wellbore data from at least one previously drilled wellbore which is determined to be comparable to said particular wellbore;

15

(b) providing an inference engine computer program consisting of executable program instructions, and adapted to utilize a plurality of wellbore parameters, including said forensic wellbore data;

20

(c) loading said inference engine computer program on to a data processing system;

(d) supplying as an input to said inference engine computer program said forensic wellbore data and at least one other of said plurality of wellbore parameters; and

25

(e) utilizing said data processing system to execute program instructions of said inference engine computer program to apply said input to said inference engine computer program and to produce as an output an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit in said particular wellbore.

30

2. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 1, further comprising:

(f) obtaining empirical wellbore data from said particular wellbore during drilling operations; and

35

(g) additionally supplying said empirical wellbore data as an input to said inference engine computer program.

5

3. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 1, wherein said forensic wellbore data includes at least log data which indicates sand content.

10

4. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 1, wherein said forensic wellbore data includes at least one of:

(a) data which relates to sand content; and

15

(b) data which relates to formation strength.

5. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 1, wherein said forensic wellbore data includes both of:

20

(a) data which relates to sand content; and

(b) data which relates to formation strength.

25

6. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 1, wherein said forensic wellbore data includes both of:

(a) log data which provides an indication of likely sand content at particular depths; and

30

(b) log data which provides an indication of likely formation strength at particular depths.

35

7. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 1, wherein said data which provides an indication of likely formation strength at a particular depth comprises data which provides an indication of likely unconfined compressive strength of formations at

5 particular depths.

8. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 1, wherein said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit comprises a numerical indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit.

10

9. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 1, wherein said numerical indicator comprises a numerical value in the range between an upper boundary value and a lower boundary value.

15

10. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 2:

20

(h) wherein said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit is generated repeatedly during drilling operations; and

(i) wherein said indicator provides an indication of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit before abrasive wear occurs.

25

11. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 10 further comprising:

(j) altering at least one drilling condition in response to said indicator in order to diminish the probability of abrasive wear of a drill bit occurring.

30

12. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 11, wherein said at least one drilling condition includes at least one of:

35

- (1) mud type;
- (2) bit type;
- (3) bit hydraulics;
- (4) rotary speed; and

5 (5) weight on bit.

13. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 1, wherein said inference engine comprises a rule matrix.

10 14. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 13, wherein said rule matrix establishes correspondence between said plurality of wellbore parameters and said indicator.

15 15. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 13, wherein said rule matrix defines a plurality of fuzzy sets.

20 16. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 15, wherein said each of said fuzzy sets is identified to at least one corresponding membership function.

25 17. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 16, wherein collectively said fuzzy sets define a responsive surface which relates said plurality of wellbore parameters to said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit.

18. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 13:

30 wherein said rule matrix is composed of a plurality of qualitative descriptions for each said plurality of wellbore parameters; and

wherein each of said plurality of qualitative descriptions has a

5 numerical value associated therewith;

wherein said inference engine computer program combines the effects of said plurality of wellbore parameters through said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit in said particular wellbore.

10

19. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 18, wherein said numerical value which is associated with each of said plurality of qualitative descriptions is adjustable in order to allow modification of said inference engine.

15

20. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 19, wherein said numerical value which is associated with each of said plurality of qualitative descriptions is adjustable in order to allow modification of said inference engine, in order to allow calibration of a response surface which defines a universe of possible values for said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit.

20

21. An apparatus for providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit in a particular wellbore, comprising:

25

- (a) a data processing system adapted for execution of program instructions;
- (b) an inference engine computer program composed of executable program instructions, and including:

5

(1) an inference engine program module which includes a rule matrix which establishes correspondence between a plurality of wellbore parameters and an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit and which combines the effects of at least two distinct wellbore parameters utilizing said rule matrix in order to produce as an output an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit; and

(2) an input program module for receiving data corresponding to at least two of said plurality of wellbore parameters and supplying said data to said inference engine program module.

22. The apparatus for providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 21, wherein said inference engine further includes:

(3) an output program which provides in a human-readable format said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit.

23. The apparatus for providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 22, wherein said indicator for potential abrasive wear of a drill bit is presented in human-readable format of a single numeric value from a range of available numeric values between an upper numeric limit and a lower numeric limit.

24. The apparatus for providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 21, wherein said inference engine computer program further includes:

(3) program instructions for recursively computing said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit during drilling operations.

5 25. The apparatus for providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of
a drill bit according to Claim 21, wherein said input program module of said
inference engine computer program comprises:

10 (2) an input program module for receiving data corresponding to at
least two following distinct wellbore parameters:

 (a) forensic wellbore data from at least one previously drilled
wellbore which is determined to be comparable to a subject wellbore; and

15 (b) empirical wellbore data related to said subject wellbore;
and

for supplying said data to said inference engine program module.

20 26. The apparatus for providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of
a drill bit according to Claim 21, wherein said inference engine program module
includes a rule matrix which establishes correspondence between the two
following distinct wellbore parameters:

25 (a) forensic wellbore data from at least one previously drilled
wellbore which is determined to be comparable to a subject wellbore; and

 (b) other wellbore data related to said subject wellbore; and

30 and an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit, by combining the
effects of the forensic wellbore data and the other wellbore data utilizing said
rule matrix in order to produce as an output and indicator of potential for
abrasive wear of a drill bit of said subject wellbore.

35 27. A method of drilling a wellbore, comprising:

 (a) obtaining forensic wellbore data from at least one previously
drilled wellbore which is determined to be comparable to a target wellbore;

5

(b) providing an inference engine computer program consisting of executable program instructions, and adapted to utilize a plurality of wellbore parameters, including said forensic wellbore data;

10

(c) loading said inference engine computer program on to a data processing system;

15

(d) supplying as an input to said inference engine computer program said forensic wellbore data and at least one other of said plurality of wellbore parameters;

20

(e) utilizing said data processing system to execute program instructions of said inference engine computer program to apply said input to said inference engine computer program and to produce as an output an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit in said target wellbore;

25

(f) providing a plurality of available rock bits for use in drilling particular portions of said target wellbore, with particular ones of said plurality of available rock bits having different resistance to abrasive wear which corresponds generally to said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit;

30

(g) selecting a particular one of said plurality of available rock bits based at least in part upon said potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit as predicted by said indication of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit;

(h) connecting said particular one of said plurality of available rock bits to a drilling string; and

35

(i) performing drilling operations.

5 28. The method drilling a wellbore according to Claim 27, further comprising:

 (j) obtaining empirical wellbore data from said target wellbore during drilling operations; and

10

 (k) additionally supplying said empirical wellbore data as an input to said inference engine computer program.

15

29. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 27, wherein said forensic wellbore data includes at least log data relating to formation types.

30. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 27, wherein said forensic wellbore data includes at least one of:

20

- (a) data which relates to sand content; and
- (b) data which relates to formation strength.

25

31. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 27, wherein said forensic wellbore data includes both of:

- (a) data which relates to sand content; and
- (b) data which relates to formation strength.

30

32. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 27, wherein said forensic wellbore data includes both of:

35

 (a) log data which provides an indication of likely sand content at particular depths; and

5

(b) log data which provides an indication of likely formation strength at particular depths.

10 33. The method of providing an indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit according to Claim 27, wherein said data which provides an indication of likely formation strength at a particular depth comprises data which provides an indication of likely unconfined compressive strength of formations at particular depths.

15 34. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 27, wherein said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit comprises a numerical indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit.

20 35. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 27, wherein said numerical indicator comprises a numerical value in the range between an upper boundary value and a lower boundary value.

36. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 27:

25 (l) wherein said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit is generated repeatedly during drilling operations; and

(m) wherein said indicator provides an indication of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit before drilling occurs.

30

37. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 36, further comprising:

35 (n) altering at least one drilling condition in response to said indicator in order to diminish the probability of abrasive wear of a drill bit occurring.

5 38. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 37, wherein said at least one drilling-condition includes at least one of:

- (1) mud type;
- (2) bit type; ←
- (3) bit hydraulics;
- 10 (4) rotary speed; and ←
- (5) weight on bit.

39. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 27, wherein said inference engine comprises a rule matrix.

15

40. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 39, wherein said rule matrix establishes correspondence between said plurality of wellbore parameters and said indicator.

20

41. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 39, wherein said rule matrix defines a plurality of fuzzy sets.

25 42. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 41, wherein said each of said fuzzy sets is identified to at least one corresponding membership function.

30 43. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 42, wherein collectively said fuzzy sets define a responsive surface which relates said plurality of wellbore parameters to said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit.

5

44. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 39:

wherein said rule matrix is composed of a plurality of qualitative descriptions for each said plurality of wellbore parameters; and

10

wherein each of said plurality of qualitative descriptions has a numerical value associated therewith; and

15

wherein said inference engine computer program combines the effects of said plurality of wellbore parameters through said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit in said target wellbore.

20

45. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 44, wherein said numerical value which is associated with each of said plurality of qualitative descriptions is adjustable in order to allow modification of said inference engine.

25

46. The method of drilling a wellbore according to Claim 45, wherein said numerical value which is associated with each of said plurality of qualitative descriptions is adjustable in order to allow modification of said inference engine, in order to allow calibration of a response surface which defines a universe of possible values for said indicator of potential for abrasive wear of a drill bit.

1/15




FIG. 1

2/15




FIG. 2

3/15




FIG. 3

4/15




FIG. 4

5/15




FIG. 5

6/15





FIG. 6

7/15

Insitu Strength
max principle stress @ failure



$$s_1 = 2S_0(\cos \phi)/(1 - \sin \phi) + s_3(1 + \sin \phi)/(1 - \sin \phi)$$

BHP

FIG. 7

8/15

Abrasivity Index
Rule Matrix

		Sand Content			
		NS	LS	MS	HS
Strength	LS	NA	NA	LA	MA
	MS	NA	LA	MA	SA
	HS	LA	MA	SA	SA

FIG. 8

9/15

Fuzzy Sets





FIG. 9

10/15

Input Fuzzy Set: Strength



Confined Compressive Strength, psi

FIG. 10

11/15





FIG. 11

12/15




Abrasive Index x 10, no units

FIG. 12

13/15

Example of Abrasivity Index for Beta Test Site

Rocky32 Estimated Lithology



Abrasion Index




FIG. 13

14/15




FIG. 14

15/15

TABLE 1
Abrasion Index Strategy

Index Parameter	Potential Abrasion related parameters	Comments
Sand content lithology identifier	Comments	Quartz sand grains are the prevalent abrasive mineral encountered while drilling for oil and gas wells. They are abrasive because of their high hardness. (Mohs hardness = 7)
Insitu strength sonic transit times lithology identifier porosity	Angle of internal friction and cohesion	Both of these are strength parameters that determine how tightly the sand grains are held in place under stressed conditions.

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No

PCT/US 00/04626

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER

IPC 7 E21B44/00 E21B49/00

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)

IPC 7 E21B E21C

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practical, search terms used)

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
X	US 5 794 720 A (GOLDMAN WILLIAM A ET AL) 18 August 1998 (1998-08-18) column 7, line 9 - line 46 ----	1,2, 7-12, 27-29, 33-38
A	US 5 305 836 A (HOLBROOK PHILIP ET AL) 26 April 1994 (1994-04-26) column 4, line 40 -column 5, line 18 ----	3-6, 30-32
A	US 5 312 163 A (HANAMOTO TADAYUKI ET AL) 17 May 1994 (1994-05-17) abstract ----- -/-	13-26, 29-46

☒ Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C.

☒ Patent family members are listed in annex.

* Special categories of cited documents :

"A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance

"E" earlier document but published on or after the international filing date

"L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)

"O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means

"P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

"T" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

"X" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

"Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art.

"&" document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

14 June 2000

Date of mailing of the international search report

04/07/2000

Name and mailing address of the ISA

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentaan 2
NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk
Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,
Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Garrido Garcia, M

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No

PCT/US 00/04626

C.(Continuation) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
P,A	IRRGANG ET AL: "A Case-Based System to Cut Drilling Costs" SOCIETY OF PETROLEUM ENGINEERS, vol. 56504, 3 - 6 October 1999, XP000920551 page 2, column 2, paragraph 3 -page 3, column 1, paragraph 2 ---	1-46
A	BILGESU, TETRICK ET AL.: "A New Approach for the Prediction of Rate of Penetration Values" SOCIETY OF PETROLEUM ENGINEERS, vol. 39231, 22 - 24 October 1997, XP002140111 page 2, column 1, paragraph 1 - paragraph 2 ---	1-46
A	SINOR, WARREN: "Drag Bit Wear Model" SOCIETY OF PETROLEUM ENGINEERS, vol. 16699, June 1989 (1989-06), XP002140112 page 128, column 1, paragraph 4 page 128, column 2, paragraph 6 page 132, column 1, paragraph 3 -column 2, paragraph 2 -----	1-46

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Information on patent family members

International Application No

PCT/US 00/04626

Patent document cited in search report	Publication date	Patent family member(s)	Publication date
US 5794720 A	18-08-1998	AU 709128 B	19-08-1999
		AU 2338997 A	17-10-1997
		BR 9708257 A	03-08-1999
		CA 2250030 A	02-10-1997
		CN 1214754 A	21-04-1999
		GB 2328467 A,B	24-02-1999
		NO 984454 A	12-11-1998
		WO 9736084 A	02-10-1997
US 5305836 A	26-04-1994	CA 2093041 A	09-10-1993
		GB 2265923 A,B	13-10-1993
		GB 2290330 A,B	20-12-1995
		NO 931300 A	11-10-1993
US 5312163 A	17-05-1994	JP 2090200 C	02-09-1996
		JP 4073398 A	09-03-1992
		JP 7119551 B	20-12-1995
		KR 9707382 B	08-05-1997
		EP 0541804 A	19-05-1993
		WO 9201140 A	23-01-1992

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☒ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☒ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.